



ATTACHMENT A

Remarks

Considering the matters raised in the Office Action in the same order as raised, claims 29 and 30 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph as being "indefinite." This rejection is respectfully traversed.

It is respectfully submitted that one of ordinary skill in the art would understand that a "major" surface of a device would be the major surface with respect to the area covered thereby. This is consistent with the specification and drawings even though the word "major" is not used in the specification. However, in order to expedite the prosecution, claim 30 which has been rewritten in independent form, now recites "a major areal surface" (emphasis added). Claim 29 has been cancelled and, with the change made in claim 30, it is respectfully submitted that this claim is now fully in accordance with the requirements of 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph.

Turning to the rejections on prior art, most of the independent claims have been amended to more clearly define over the cited references. With the exception of claim 20, the amendments to the claims are directed to features corresponding to those set forth in allowable claim 18. Before considering the amendments made to the other independent claims, it is noted that claim 18 has been amended to delete a double recitation therein. This double recitation was also included in claim 17 on which claim 18 was based and was the result of an amendment made to claim 17 much earlier in the prosecution (in the Amendment dated August 16, 1999).

Turning to claim 1, claim 1, as amended, recites that the housing has a cavity in an upper surface thereof and the connector is disposed proximate to the cavity so that the device is positioned in the cavity when the connectors are coupled. It is respectfully submitted that this language clearly defines over both the Garthwaite et al patent (wherein the "cavity" is located in the side of the keyboard) and the Kikinis patent (wherein the "cavity" (to the extent that there is one) is located in the side of the keyboard).

Independent claim 17 recites that the conductor disposed within the housing is positioned in the housing such that a PDA that communicates with the computer when the connectors are coupled rests on an upper surface of the housing. Claim 17, as amended, thus defines over the Garthwaite et al and Kikinis patent for reasons similar to those discussed above in connection with amended claim 1.

Claim 20 has been amended to incorporate the subject matter of claim 21 therein and to more clearly define the relationship between the keyboard and the “device.” In particular, claim 20 recites that the device abuts against the end surface of the housing when the connections are coupled and further recites that the connector of the device is coupled, in use, to the connector of the housing such that at least one of a top surface and a bottom surface of the device is flush with, so as to be disposed in a common plane with, a corresponding surface of the housing. It is respectfully submitted that this language clearly defines over the Kikinis patent wherein, in Figure 20, the device 10 is connected to the keyboard 151 by a cable 153. With respect to the argument made in the Office Action regarding this feature, it is respectfully submitted that, the mere fact that it would be possible to position device 10 so as to abut the keyboard, does not mean that such an arrangement meets the terms of claim 20, as amended. Specifically, claim 20 requires that the keyboard and the device abut when the connectors are coupled, and that the keyboard and device have the claimed relationship wherein at least one of a top surface and a bottom surface of the device is flush with, so as to be disposed in a common plane with, a corresponding surface of the housing.

A new claim 31 has been added which depends from claim 20 and recites some details of the coupling means shown in figures 4a and 4b.

Finally, with respect to claim 30, this claim recites that the housing includes a cradle cavity in which the device nests and which includes a support surface on which a major areal surface of the device rests. Again, this claim defines over

the Garthwaite et al and Kikinis et al patents for reasons similar to those discussed above with respect to claims 1 and 17.

Allowance of the application in its present form is respectfully solicited.

END REMARKS